



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/496,405	02/02/2000	Michiaki Uchikawa	0879-0252P	6155

7590 11/26/2004
Michael K. Mutter
Birch Stewart Kolasch & Birch LLP
P O Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

HENN, TIMOTHY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/496,405

Applicant(s)

UCHIKAWA, MICHIAKI

Examiner

Timothy J Henn

Art Unit

2612

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
10. ☐ Other: _____

WENDY R. GABBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

WENDY R. GABBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Sato in view of Anderson does not disclose a system which converts original image data into display image data if conversion is necessary. However, as can be seen in Figures 13, 14A and Column 7, Lines 8-32 of Sato, this feature is disclosed. Sato discloses a system which determines a display's inherent resolution and selectively thins the image signal to conform to that inherent resolution if necessary. The applicant further argues that "Anderson's teaching of an enhanced image file only suggests converting a captured image in a format displayable on an internal LCD device in a digital camera". While this may be true if Anderson is looked at alone, it is noted that the rejection is based on the combination of Sato and Anderson. In this combination Sato is relied upon for the basic structure of the camera and the selective conversion of original image data into display image data. Anderson is solely relied upon to teach the storing of different resolution versions of a single image together in a file which is stored on the recording medium in order to quickly display a full resolution image on a display without the delay of having to resize the original image data (Anderson, Column 6, Line 51 - Column 7, Line 5). By adding this teaching into Sato it is noted that the basic structure of Sato would not significantly change. The combination based on Sato would still need to determine the resolution of the LCD prior to converting the original image data into display image data (if needed), however the original image data and the display image data would be stored together in a single file as taught by Anderson to accelerate the user interface when the image is displayed on the display in the future since resizing the original image data would not be necessary.